



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

reason. Armaments must be adequate, in the first place, to prevent the dire necessity that "I and my four sons" should be forced to the front through the supine neglect of traitorous pacifists to provide "adequate armaments;"* they must be adequate to meet the emergency of Europe crossing the Atlantic to attack the Monroe Doctrine in Latin America, or of Japan and the Yellow peril causing the sun of our national greatness to set in the Pacific; of perfidious Albion striking at our hearts through Canada, or of Germany causing our twenty millions of German-Americans to hurry us headlong into a civil armageddon! Adequate for what or whom? Why, for *anything* or *anyone*, for *everything* and *all the world*! Who but the pusillanimous or the treasonable would measure words or seek for definiteness when Old Glory is at stake?

In sad and sober earnest, the peaceful character and the peaceful future of our beloved country are involved in the present crisis of world history. The Roosevelts and Mahans; the Bernhardis and von Treitschkes of America are overworking their opportunity to convince us that the best and only way to preserve our peace is to prepare for war—to build up "adequate armaments." They are emphasizing, as the twofold lesson taught America by the present war, that "peace treaties, arbitration treaties, neutrality treaties, Hague treaties, and the like," are indeed but scraps of paper, and that "Uncle Sam's own stout heart and ready hand"—that is to say, "adequate armaments"—alone can defend our country's "vital interest and honor." They are pointing to Belgium's plight as the result of relying on a treaty; but they ignore the vital fact that this treaty was guaranteed by only three nations instead of by forty-four, as would be the case at The Hague; they evade, as the cause of Belgium's broken treaty, Germany's "adequate armaments," and say naught of the proved inadequacy of Belgium's supposedly "adequate" armaments for defense. They contrast Luxemburg's "unpreparedness" with the "impregnable" fortresses of France, but fail to include the "irresistible" artillery of the Krupps as a feature of "adequate armaments." They hint ominously at England's fate in the absence of her "adequate navy," but gloss over Germany's attempt to secure an "adequate navy" as the fundamental cause of England's participation in the war and of England's chief alarm, now that the war has begun. They despise the Hague conventions as preservers of the peace and as mitigators of the horrors of the war; but they ignore the significant fact that all the participants in the war are moving heaven and earth to convince the world that *they* are living up to the standard erected at The Hague, and that their opponents should be eternally damned for disregarding it.

* Cf. an article by Theodore Roosevelt in *The New York Times*, September 27, 1914.

Throughout their clamorous argument, our American advocates of "adequate armaments" shut their eyes and ears and teeth to the insistent fact that the prime and sole sufficient cause of the present world-wide war is Europe's pursuit during the last half century of that will-o'-the-wisp—"adequate armaments"—and of the illusory "peace" based upon them. Ever since Bismarck began in deadly earnest the era of blood and iron, and put in serious practice the "barrack philosophy of peace," Europe has been bending every effort to preserve "the peace" by piling up "adequate armaments," with the inevitable result that twentieth century "Christian" men, aided by all the devices of twentieth century "civilization," are engaged in a combat which would make the beasts of the jungle green with envy and the fiends of Satan applaud in hellish glee.

Our own country has come definitely to the parting of the ways. Shall it pursue the path of "adequate armaments," which will lead us inevitably, as it has led Europe, into the abyss? or shall it push on upon the path of "adequate justice," which the world entered upon so few years ago at The Hague, and on which it has already found such remarkable gifts of genuine peace and justice? The issue has been definitely drawn between the Temple of Mars and the Palace of Peace. And well it is that this has been done, for the world must know that it cannot serve both God and Mammon; that it cannot follow both Christ and Odin; that it cannot receive the blessing of Jehovah while laying its heart on the altar of Baal.

H.

Efforts to Convene the International Peace Bureau.

Earnest recommendations that the Commission of the International Peace Bureau at Berne be called to meet at the earliest possible moment have been sent out by Dr. Ludwig Quidde, president of the German Peace Society (who is now at The Hague), and Dr. B. de Jong Van Beek-En Donk, editor of the organ of the Dutch Peace Society. Both men have issued open letters, urging their reasons for at least an attempt to bring together an assembly of the leading pacifists of the different countries to discuss the situation and establish united efforts for peace. It is probably impossible to convene such a meeting at the present moment, because of the difficulties and dangers of travel, etc.; but the earnest efforts of the European peace workers will bring about the desired result in due time.

Dr. Quidde presents several cogent reasons for his request that the Commission of the Peace Bureau be called together, and enumerates certain of the tasks which it should at once undertake. These are:

(1) The *mobilization* of public opinion in the neutral countries. The formation of committees represent-

ing all organizations and parties to carry on the campaign for mediation and pacific settlement. This should be done on the initiative and under the unifying agency of the Berne Bureau. In short, the bureau is the natural and logical international center for the movement for peace.

(2) There should be bureaus for communication between the pacifists of the belligerent countries and their fellow-workers. Berne and The Hague have already become such centers, but others are needed.

(3) Interchange of reliable and non-partisan news. National passion is inflamed and hatred stirred up by the one-sided and fantastic reports that are being spread abroad. Perhaps there should be published a bulletin for the dissemination of accurate information.

(4) Shall there be a declaration by the pacifists concerning the violations of international law? Shall these be investigated by an impartial commission?

(5) Documents should be collected dealing with the history that preceded the outbreak of the war.

(6) A commission perhaps ought to be formed to prepare for the international treaty to be made after the restoration of peace.

In conclusion, Dr. Quidde says:

"It appears to me almost equally important that we should, through our meeting, make known to all the world our international solidarity, as one of the few international organizations which stand firm amid the general disintegration and which unite in a friendly manner the representatives of the 'hostile' peoples.

"Also in the interest of our own organization it is especially desirable that leading pacifists of the various countries, particularly of the countries at war, should come into personal relations with each other, and upon neutral ground, in the sphere of internationalism, temporarily break loose from the one-sided information and the nationalistic influences to which many even of our pacifists run the risk of yielding. We can remain international without being untrue to the duties which every man has to fulfill toward his own country, and we must so remain if we have ever been truly in earnest in our profession of pacifist ideals."

Dr. de Jong Van Beek En Donk states four reasons why he desires the calling of the Berne Bureau:

(1) It should lead in combining and giving utterance to the different ideas now finding expression in the neutral countries.

(2) It ought to form an international organization of pacifists, a separate organization, to include representatives of all sorts of bodies. In Holland, for example, the Dutch Peace Society has formed a "Dutch Council against War," consisting of representatives of all political organizations, labor parties, and the like.

(3) It could make use of the present time to study the great problems which will demand solution after the war closes; small committees could be named to study limitation of armaments, a federation of the nations, the abolition of secret diplomacy, etc.

(4) It could declare its continued belief in *internationalism*, and speak for all the pacifists of all the nations as with one voice.

The Dutch proposal for a world petition is explained—a petition which is to be prepared in each

country, signatures obtained, and to be presented at the time when the proffer of mediation is accepted. Also there has originated with them a plan for great public peace demonstrations in each country for the treaty of peace. He calls special attention to the memorial to President Wilson, prepared by representatives of the American Association for International Conciliation, the American Peace Society, the Church Peace Union, and other peace societies of America, asking for a *joint* offer of mediation by all the neutral nations, and for the co-operation of the *neutral* as well as the belligerent powers in the terms of peace and the regulation of international relations.

While the convocation of the International Peace Bureau at the present moment is impossible, it is opportune for the peace workers of all the countries to be considering these matters, so forcibly called to our attention by our European friends, and to plan for national unification and organization as preparatory to the international work of the near future.

Our Personal Appeal.

The American Peace Society is face to face with a remarkable situation. Having labored continuously for eighty-six years against the crime of war, it beholds eight of the nations committing just that crime wildly and on an unprecedented scale. Of course, the peace workers have been stunned. Indeed, at first thought it might seem as if the labors and the consecration of a century have been sadly wasted.

But, on the contrary, it begins to appear rather that the ancient teachings of our society are beginning to be understood in these days, and that to the satisfaction of many persons who heretofore have chosen to ignore or in some cases to despise those teachings. It is quite unnecessary in the United States to argue against war today. This was not true in June, but it is now. Events in Europe are teaching the lessons of Noah Worcester, William Ladd, Elihu Burritt, and Charles Sumner far more effectively even than did they. The tale is being told at last with an informing emphasis. A century of "pacifists" are being vindicated, horribly enough, but vindicated.

But are the lessons to strike home? Are the egregious errors of thinking responsible for this gigantic curse to be uprooted forever? Is the hideous institution of militarism to be continued after the terms of peace are made? Or shall an international machinery be devised as a rational substitute for war? Can war be forever abolished?

We have always believed, and still believe, that it can. The soldiers fighting today in the trenches, the statesmen, diplomats, and many militarists even, are urging that it can and should be. But if it is abolished, it will be because the great world conscience, aroused as it is, shall be organized for expression and action. These high aims cannot be left to themselves—they cannot be left to the governments alone.

The unusual situation, therefore, presents an unusual opportunity, especially for America. If only the principles urged for so long by this society can become active